

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 10-19 are all the claims presently pending in the application.

It is noted that Applicant specifically states that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

With respect to the prior art rejections, claims 1-7 and 10-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2004/0043798 to Amerga et al., further in view of US Patent 6,766,169 to Cooper. Claims 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,477,372 to Otting et al., further in view of Cooper.

These rejections are respectfully traversed in the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

As described and defined in, for example, claim 1, the present invention is directed to a method of network acquisition for a cellular radio communications device arranged for operation in accordance with a plurality of radio technologies. One radio technology is searched to identify a suitable cell. Subsequent to identifying a suitable cell on the one radio technology, cells on another of the plurality of radio technologies are also monitored in order to identify if one of the monitored cells is more suitable than the cell identified on the one radio technology. Subsequent to monitoring, the cell identified from all of the radio technologies searched as being the most suitable is selected and camping, as an initial camping during a power up sequence, onto that cell.

The conventional method demonstrated in Figure 1, initially camps onto the first cell identified as satisfactory. If the subsequent search of other technologies identifies another better cell, the device must then de-camp from the initial cell in order to re-camp onto the newly-identified, more suitable, cell. As explained at lines 22-28 on page 2 of the original specification, this conventional method causes significant loss of time and energy consumption.

The claimed invention, on the other hand, teaches that the initial camping onto a satisfactory cell can occur only after determining the most suitable cell, including searching the other technologies for that most suitable cell, thereby precluding the time and energy

expenditure of the conventional method in which camping must occur to a new cell.

Moreover, as clearly described by even the independent claims, the search for the most suitable cell begins by first identifying a suitable cell on one of the RATs.

II. THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

The Examiner alleges that Amerga, when modified by Cooper, renders obvious the claimed invention defined by claims 1-7 and 10-19, and that Otting, when also modified by Cooper, renders obvious claims 18 and 19. Applicants submit, however, that there are elements of the claimed invention which are neither taught nor suggested by Amerga or Otting.

More specifically, a key feature of the present invention is that the initial camping does not occur until after all the RATs are monitored to determine which station is the most suitable. This process eliminates the need to go through the complicated and energy consuming task of having to de-camp from one initial cell should another cell be determined as more suitable and camping again to that more suitable cell.

However, as indicated by, for example, independent claim 1, this process is defined in a manner that is not suggested in the prior art of record. That is, according to claim 1, the process of the present invention is:

- 1) search and identify a suitable cell on one of the available RATs; THEN
- 2) monitor cells on each of the other available RATs; THEN
- 3) camp on the cell determined to be most suitable from all of the RATs as the initial camping.

As dependent claims 2 and 3 further describe, this monitoring of other cells on the other RATs is relative to the suitable cell already identified in the first RAT.

Applicants submit that, to one having ordinary skill in the art, neither Amerga nor Otting teaches this precise method of initial camping, wherein a suitable cell is first identified and the search on the remaining RATs are relative to this first-identified suitable cell.

The rejection currently of record ignores the plain meaning of the claim language.

That is, in neither Amerga nor Otting is there a suggestion to first identify a suitable cell in one of the RATs and then, using this suitable cell as a reference for neighboring cells in other RATs, searching these neighboring cells for the most suitable cell in all the RATs.

The description at line 41 of column 1 through line 31 of column 2 of Cooper relate to a table of most recently used systems and does not, therefore, overcome this basic deficiency of Amerga and Otting.

Hence, turning to the clear language of the claims, in Otting there is no teaching or suggestion of: “.... searching to identify a suitable cell on one radio technology (RAT); ... and subsequent to said monitoring, selecting and camping, as an initial camping during a power up sequence, on a cell identified from all of the radio technologies searched as most suitable”, as required by claim 1. The remaining independent claims have similar language or concepts.

Moreover, dependent claims 2, 3, and 10 (as well as independent claims 7, 15, 18 and 19) further require that the search in other RATs are neighboring cells of the identified suitable cell in the first RAT. None of the prior art of record suggests this type of search of RATs for the initial camping station.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection based on Amerga, Otting, and Cooper.

III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-7 and 10-19, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Date: 3/6/07

McGinn IP Law Group, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254

Respectfully Submitted,



Frederick E. Cooperrider, Esq.
Registration No. 36,769